

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 14 are amended. In particular, the claims are amended for clarity. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in Applicants' original application, for example, at page 3, lines 3-8; page 3 line 22-page 4, line 7; page 4, line 25-page 5, line 4; page 13, lines 3-21; and Figures 3A, 3B and 4. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Pan and Truong in the January 15, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 10 and 11 are objected to because of informalities. Claims 10 and 11 have been amended responsive to the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nakagawa, U.S. Patent No. 6,931,541 in view of Kadowaki, U.S. Patent No. 6,674,537. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

During the personal interview, the Examiners agreed that Nakagawa and Kadowaki, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose all the features recited in independent claims 1, 9, 11, 13, and 14.

The Examiners agreed that Nakagawa fails to disclose an image display medium, that is a sheet of paper, on which an unencrypted first image is visibly displayed without authentication, as clarified in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent claims 9, 11, 13, and 14. Furthermore, Nakagawa fails to teach or suggest that the image display medium includes a data supply apparatus, which stores therein encrypted data of a second image which is not visible and authentication data used for an access authentication to the data of the second image, as variably recited in independent claims 1, 9, 11, 13, and 14.

In addition, Nakagawa fails to disclose an image forming section for forming the first image and the second image when the access to the data of the second image is authenticated, and for forming the first image when authentication fails, as recited in independent claims 1 and 11 and as similarly recited in independent claims 13 and 14.

Nakagawa merely discloses a video authentication procedure using a network (Col. 5, lines 34-43 and Fig. 3). According to Nakagawa, after the check authentication step 206 has completed, the control unit notifies the motion image decoding unit 17 to proceed with the video data stream decoding process (Col. 5, lines 34-43). Furthermore, according to Nakagawa, the object streams are always authenticated (Col. 2, lines 8-27; Col. 5, lines 28-67; and Figure 3). Thus, Nakagawa fails to disclose: (1) an image display medium that is a sheet of paper; (2) a visible and unauthenticated first image; (3) an encrypted second image which is not visible; and (4) forming the first image and the second image when the access to the data of the second image is authenticated, and forming the first image when authentication fails. Therefore, Nakagawa fails to disclose all of the features recited in independent claims 1, 9, 11, 13, and 14.

Kadowaki fails to cure the deficiencies of Nakagawa with respect to independent claims 1, 9, 11, 13, and 14.

Kadowaki discloses a data processing method for a network connected image processing apparatus (Col. 21, lines 6-8). According to Kadowaki, a color copying machine 71 has a network scanner capable of transmitting image data that is obtained by reading a document image to a plurality of external machines. Thus, Kadowaki merely discloses a scanner that reads visible image data from the surface of a piece of paper and correspondingly forms an image of the visible data. Kadowaki fails to disclose that the piece of paper (image display medium) contains an unencrypted first image visibly displayed without authentication and encrypted data of a second image which is not visible and that the first image and the

second image are formed when the access to the data of the second image is authenticated, and the first image is formed when authentication fails, as variably recited in independent claims 1, 9, 11, 13, and 14.


In addition, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Nakagawa and Kadowaki because they are directed towards two divergent fields of endeavor because Nakagawa is directed to authentication and decoding of video image data streams while Kadowaki is directed to a network connected image processing apparatus. Therefore, it would not have been obvious or predictable to combine the teachings of Nakagawa and Kadowaki to arrive at the subject matter of independent claims 1, 9, 11, 13, and 14. Moreover, even if combined, the combination fails to teach all recited features. Accordingly, these claims and claims 2-8, 10, and 12 dependent therefrom are allowable.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:OOA/cfr

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: January 22, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--